

# Plumas County Children and Families Commission

## Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, December 5, 2001

9:00 a.m.-11:40 a.m.

Conference Room, Public Works Building  
1834 East Main Street, Quincy

### Attendees:

Commissioners: Carol Burney, Tami Davison, Bill Dennison, Shelley Miller, Jose Pereira, Elliot Smart, and Irasema Tavares  
Staff: Ellen Vieira, Ex. Dir., and Diana Conen, and Kelly Marschall, (TASC Consultant)  
Public: Michael Butler, Sandy Norton, and Susan Orange.

### I. Introductions:

Chairperson Miller opened the meeting at 9:08 a.m. The Commissioners and meeting attendees introduced themselves.

### II. Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

### III. Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: Mr. Dennison, seconded by Mr. Smart, moved to approve the Minutes of the November 5, 2001 meeting as written. VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### IV. Executive Director's Report:

#### a. State Commission Update

Ms. Vieira referred the Commissioners to her written report for current information on State Commission and Association activities. She distributed the Advisory Opinion regarding the "supplementing versus the supplanting" of funds. This document was developed by the legal counsel of the State Commission and is not an official opinion from the Attorney General. It defines the terms "supplement and supplants" which determines how funds collected pursuant to the California Children and Families Commission Act can be used.

#### b. Regional Dental Project Update

Plumas County will be hosting a meeting for the Regional Dental Project on January 4<sup>th</sup> from 10:30 am-3:00pm. Representatives from Plumas, Sierra, and Lassen counties will be attending to discuss both long-term and immediate solutions to the dental needs that have been identified in each of these counties. Ms. Vieira requested this meeting due to

concerns that the PCCF Commission have expressed regarding the extended planning and lack of direct services that have resulted from the project. Modoc County is not participating in the Regional Dental Project. The State Commission matched \$40,000 to the project and they will require a resource guide and prevention model that will be shared with other counties. The total funds available for the regional project are \$70,000.

**c. CCAFA Update**

Ms. Vieira distributed a second draft of the California Children and Families Association- Minimum Allocation Proposal for the 8 small population counties (including Plumas), and a chart showing the current and proposed allocations. The State Commission has invited the Association to present a long-term solution to the base \$200,000 allocation to the 8 smallest counties and also a proposal to stabilize the administrative augmentation that 31 rural counties receive. The Rural Caucus has had several teleconferences and special meetings in November and December 2001 to develop the minimum counties proposal and the administrative augmentation proposal.

The long-term solution developed for the minimum allocation would be to increase the minimum allocation to \$500,000 and maintain the travel and administrative augmentations as is. The \$500,000 would include 16 counties instead of 8 and cost the State Commission approximately 5.5 million dollars. Criteria are currently being developed for a county to qualify for the increase and participation would be optional. Counties would have to increase their evaluation efforts and direct some funds towards projects such as school readiness, dental, or transportation. The Rural Caucus has also decided that due to the state budget problems that they would not ask for an increase in the administrative augmentation funding, but request that the State Commission continue the funding to the 31 counties. Both proposals will request a 5-year fund allocation from the CCFC. The Rural Caucus will meet again December 11, 2001 and ask that the full Association approve the proposal, which if approved will be presented the State Commission on January 17, 2002. Ms. Vieira stated that even though there is currently a budget crisis at the state level, the State Commission invited the small population counties to present a proposal. Ms. Vieira stated that this would probably be the last opportunity to request from the State Commission an increase in the minimum allocation. Chairperson Miller thanked Ms. Vieira for her active role in the Rural Caucus on this issue.

**V. Program Development :**

**a. Intent to Award RFA #PCCFC 02-03**

Ms. Vieira distributed the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee for awarding grants for the 18-month funding cycle January 2002 through June 2003. The applications received totaled \$375,936. The Plumas County Public Health Agency (Plumas Children's Network) submitted an application requesting \$125,000 for a home visitation program, from birth to age 1 and coordination of the distribution of the Kit for New Parents. The recommendation of the review committee was to fund the proposal for

\$75,000. The Plumas Unified School District requested \$29,000 for the continuation of the Infant Early Intervention Program funded through Plumas County Prop 10 last fiscal year. Full funding of this program was recommended. Sierra-Cascade Family Opportunities, Inc. requested \$24,106 for the continuation of the Healthy Touch Infant Massage Program that was funded last year. The review committee recommended full funding of this program, which will now include lactation consultant services. Central Plumas Recreation and Park District requested \$29,000 for the Teeter-Totters Pre-school. The review committee recommended that a grant of \$10,000 be awarded for seed money to start the program. Mountain Valley Child Development requested \$10,000 to develop a school readiness pilot project for the Chester State Preschool and the Indian Valley State Preschool. The review committee recommended full funding for this program.

The review committee did not recommend funding for the applications from Adventure Village; Graeagle Preschool; Mountain Methodists Preschool; and Plumas Crisis Intervention Center. The Commission had a discussion regarding the continued funding for the PUSD Early Intervention Program and the Healthy Touch Infant Massage Program. The Commission felt that Proposition 10 funds should not be considered the permanent funding source of any project. Programs should be seeking other sources of funding for sustainability over the long-term. PUSD and Healthy Touch Infant Massage have shown their success and ability to increase the numbers of children and families served. It was the recommendation of the evaluation committee to fund these programs for an additional funding cycle. Ms. Vieira said that the grant applications from the preschools showed a clear need for technical assistance to develop their capacity to write grants and to develop school readiness programs.

Mr. Smart, a member of the review committee, said that the recommendations would reduce the scope of some of the projects. The request from PCPHA was decreased from \$125,000 to 75,000, to reflect the committee's recommendation that the project focus only on the home visitation and the distribution of the Kit for New Parents. Commissioner Smart stated that this project represented the development of an infrastructure for integrated services to the pre-natal – age five population and their parents/caregivers. The grant to the Central Plumas Recreation and Park District for seed money to develop the personnel and curriculum piece for the Teeter-Totters Preschool was reduced from \$25,099 to \$10,000 to encourage the CPRPD to obtain additional funding from other sources to open and sustain the preschool. Ms. Vieira said that once the time period for protest letters has expired, she would enter into contract negotiations to determine the scope of work for each project. Mr. Smart noted that he did not participate in the evaluation of the PUSD application due to a possible conflict of interest.

**MOTION:** Mr. Dennison, seconded by Ms Tavares, moved to accept the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee to fund grants to the following: Plumas County Public Health Agency \$75,000; Plumas Unified School District, \$29,000; Sierra-Cascade Family Opportunities, Inc., (Healthy Touch Program), \$24,106; Central Plumas Recreation and Park District, \$10,000; and Mountain Valley Child Development, \$10,000. **VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, with Ms Burney abstaining from voting.

Chairperson Miller said that the Commission may want to fund additional “mini-grants” for equipment or seed money grants and asked that the topic be added to the January agenda. Ms. Miller said that, as one of the evaluators, she felt that there were applications from a well-rounded selection of programs, which clearly addressed gaps in existing services. Mr. Smart said that the proposals that were not recommended for funding took more of a “shotgun” approach to filling gaps in their programs.

Ms. Vieira noted that the Board of Supervisors at their meeting on December 4, 2001 had confirmed Jose Pereira as a Commissioner of the PCCFC.

**b. Technical Review and Edit of Strategic Plan FY 02-03**

Ms. Vieira introduced Kelly Marschall, a consultant from Social Entrepreneurs, Inc. in Reno, who will be working with the Commissioners on reformatting and revisions to the Strategic Plan. Ms. Marschall said that Social Entrepreneurs currently functions as staff to the CCAFA and has worked with 20 out of the 58 California counties on at least some portion of their strategic plans. Ms. Marschall is a contracted consultant with TASC, technical assistance provided by the California Children and Families Association through a grant from the David and Lucille Packard Foundation. Ms. Marschall is very aware of the current issues facing rural counties. The first objective of the plan revision is to keep those parts of the plan that have a solid foundation, and determine where changes are needed. Having clear objectives helps key stakeholders know what is needed and what the Commission’s plan is to address those areas and where to focus resources. The Strategic Plan acts as a “road map” to show where Prop 10 is and where it is going. An effective plan will be readable, simple, persuasive, and complete.

Ms. Marschall suggested a proposed “table of contents” for a new plan, and showed some sample pages from the Madera County Strategic Plan. She outlined the plan revision process, including: 1) Identify strengths of current plan. 2) Identify areas where improvement needed. 3) Determine the participants and commitment required. 4) Develop a timeline and process. 5) Complete assignments, strategic planning sessions, and data analysis activities. 6) Draft the plan and solicit feedback. 7) Incorporate feedback, check, finalize and submit the new plan for approval at a scheduled “public hearing.”

Ms. Marschall said that the current Strategic Plan shows a lot of data collection, and focus group activity to give a picture of “what is” and “how people feel” about it. What is missing is the data analysis to make the connection between that static picture and “where we want to go”. Mr. Dennison said that the Commissioners are now more experienced, and in a much better position to prioritize goals and objectives. Ms. Marschall said that results from PCCFC funded programs and the CCFC statewide evaluation plan would be helpful. The process of getting feedback from the community will increase public awareness, show how much progress has been made, and generate investment by stakeholders. Ms. Marschall summarized the “Results Based Accountability” process developed by Mark Friedman and used by the State Commission

to evaluate the effectiveness of Proposition funded programs. The list of the 16 goals identified in the current strategic plan must be prioritized and narrowed to no more than five.

The Commissioners agreed that the concept of a "Report Card" to show progress toward goals should be included (and is included in the current Strategic Plan). There are four steps to developing a report card format, including: 1) Identify precisely what specific results or objectives the Commission seeks to achieve. 2) Describe how the indicator is measured. 3) Describe why the indicator is important, and how it will relate to healthy children, strong families, and school readiness. 4) Describe how we are doing by giving quantitative and qualitative measures.

Chairperson Miller said that the Strategic Plan revision should be done by the full Commission rather than a committee. Mr. Smart said that the Commissioners should move through the revision process together so all have the opportunity to participate. Ms. Miller said that first strategic planning process was difficult because there was no staff support, it was produced under a deadline to get it submitted to the State for approval, and there was no ownership of the finished product. Ms. Marschall asked each Commissioner to review the plan and get comments to her by January 3, 2002. Chairperson Miller directed that the business portion of the January meeting be limited to 30 minutes in order to devote the rest of the time to the Strategic Plan revision.

## **VI. Public Comment**

Susan Orange asked if the Commissioners wanted input from non-commissioners. Ms. Vieira said that any additional participation from agencies or members of the community were welcome and important to the process.

## **VII. Closed Session**

The Commissioners adjourned to closed session at 11:06 a. m.

The meeting was reconvened at 11:27 a.m.

**MOTION:** Mr. Dennison, seconded by Ms. Tavares, moved to increase the amount of the Executive Director's contract by 22%, effective at the end of Ms. Vieira's current contract, December 31, 2001. **VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Dennison said that the Commissioners are very pleased with Ms. Vieira's work. Chairperson Miller thanked Ms. Vieira for her patience while the Commissioners worked through the process of the performance evaluation and salary research. Ms. Vieira also thanked the Commission for their support and looks forward to the coming year working to improve the lives of our youngest citizens.

MOTION: Mr. Smart, seconded by Mr. Dennison, moved that a committee be established to develop a policy for merit increases and other changes to the Executive Director's contract. VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Smart, Ms. Davison, and Ms. Burney will serve on the committee, along with Ms. Scardaci as the Plumas County Fiscal Administrator for Proposition 10 funding.

#### **VIII. Next Meetings.**

The next meeting will be held on January 9, 2002.

#### **IX. Adjournment.**

MOTION: Mr. Dennison moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms Davison.  
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by: Diana Conen